

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12/01/2026 10:53 AM from [REDACTED]

## Application Summary

Address:	Land At Rose Farm Downs Road Istead Rise Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the demolition of 64 Downs Road and erection of up to 154No. residential dwellings (including affordable housing), with all matters reserved except for access. Creation of a new access from Downs Road.
Case Officer:	Adeoye Lawal

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED]

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>I recognise and accept that new housing is required to meet local and national demand. However, I strongly object to the proposed development of 154 dwellings in Istead Rise due to the significant and detrimental impact it would have on the village's infrastructure, services, environment, and overall character. The existing infrastructure serving Istead Rise is already under considerable strain and is not capable of supporting a development of this scale. Even on conservative estimates, assuming a minimum average household size of two people (and potentially up to four), this development would introduce approximately 300-600 additional residents into a village that is not equipped to accommodate such growth.</p> <p>Local healthcare provision is already inadequate. GP services are overstretched, with residents frequently experiencing difficulty obtaining appointments. An influx of hundreds of additional residents would exacerbate this issue considerably. Similarly, local schools and nurseries are already operating at or near capacity, and it is highly likely they would be unable to absorb the increased demand generated by this development.</p> <p>Traffic and parking present a further serious concern. With most households owning at least two vehicles these days, this proposal could add 300 or more additional cars to the village. Istead Rise has very limited access and egress points, primarily via Wrotham Road and New Barn Road, both of which already experience congestion around rush hour. There are also several narrow, single-lane country roads that are wholly unsuitable for increased traffic volumes. The cumulative effect would be increased congestion, reduced road safety, and</p>

longer journey times for residents.

The proposed development would also result in the loss of farmland/greenbelt land, which is a valuable and finite resource. Allowing development on this land sets a concerning precedent and increases the likelihood of further erosion of the village's greenbelt heritage in the future.

This raises the question of why development of this scale is being proposed on greenbelt or agricultural land when alternative brownfield or less sensitive sites exist nearby. For example, the former Paramount theme park site on the Northfleet Peninsula represents a significantly larger area of underused land that could accommodate housing alongside purpose-built infrastructure such as schools, healthcare facilities, and local amenities. Developments such as Ebbfleet demonstrate that large-scale, integrated planning is achievable when undertaken in appropriate locations.

Furthermore, placing a development of this size within Istead Rise risks creating a disconnected community, with new residents forced to rely on already overstretched facilities rather than being supported by properly planned infrastructure. If permission were to be considered, it should only be on the strict condition that developers are required to fund and deliver infrastructure improvements in parallel with construction. This should include:

- Expansion of local schools capacity
- Provision of additional GP and NHS dental services
- Phased development, with no subsequent phases permitted until required infrastructure improvements are fully completed
- Increased amenities such as shops and parking

In conclusion, I object to this proposal due to the excessive scale of development in a location that cannot properly support it, the unacceptable strain on local infrastructure and services, the impact on traffic and safety, and the unnecessary loss of greenbelt and agricultural land when viable alternatives exist nearby.

---

Kind regards